CH 001 3

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 3207 **/2003**

PETITIONER : **Smt. Chitamani Sinha, W/o Shri Pradeep Kumar Sinha, aged 35 years, Occupation-Service working as Supervisor in Integrated Child Development Project, Udaipur District Sarguja, R/o Ambikapur District Sarguja (C.G)**

-VERSUS-

RESPONDENTS :

1. **State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Women & Child Development Department, Mantralaya, D.K.S.Bhavan, Raipur (C.G.).**
2. **Director, Women & Child Development Department, Raipur (C.G.).**
3. **District Programme Officer, Women & Child Development Department, Ambikapur, District Sarguja (C.G.).**
4. **Project Officer, Women & Child Development Project, Udaipur, District Sarguja (C.G.).**

P. R. No. 3110/03
Presented by Shri Nehesan Sahu
dated 6/10/03

शपथ आयुक्त
एस.के शुक्ला
बिलासपुर (छ.ग.)
6/10/03
बिलासपुर तहसील कोर्ट

WRIT UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A SUITABLE WRIT, ORDERS OR DIRECTION.

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 3207 of 2003

Petitioner: Smt. Chintamani Sinha

Versus

Respondents: State of Chhattisgarh & others

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri**.

Shri Rajeev Shrivastava Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri Pankaj Shrivastava, Panel lawyer for the Respondents/State.

ORAL ORDER

(22nd February, 2006)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The petitioner, who was working as Supervisor in Integrated Child Development Project, Udaipur, District-Surguja, was transferred to Integrated Child Development Project, Ramanujganj, District-Surguja vide impugned order dated 11.9.2003. The petitioner has filed this petition impugning the transfer order dated 11.9.2003 on the ground that the petitioner has not made any application/request for transferring her to any other place. Learned counsel further submits that it appears that some other persons has forged her signature in making application, pursuant to which the impugned transfer order was passed.

2. This Court by interim order dated 29.10.2003 stayed the operation of the impugned order dated 11.9.2003 until further orders.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that by virtue of this court's order dated 29.10.2003, the petitioner has continued on the same old place of posting and the impugned order was never

28

given effect to in respect of the petitioner. The petitioner has been granted final relief by interim order.

4. It is well settled principle of law that transfer is an incident of service and it is for the employer to decide as to where a particular officer/employee be posted keeping in view public interest as well as administrative exigency. This Court has limited jurisdiction to interfere in the transfer matter and this Court can interfere only in the case of proved malafide, non-competence of authority passing the transfer order and transfer order not being in conformity with the rules and regulations. The petitioner/employee cannot be permitted to remain at one place, forever, by Court orders. At this stage, it is not necessary to examine validity of the transfer order at this stage. In the facts of the case, the respondents are directed not to insist upon compliance of the impugned transfer order.

5. This petition has become infructuous with the passage of time. Accordingly the petition is dismissed as having become infructuous. However, respondents/authorities are at liberty to pass appropriate order for posting the petitioner in the public interest and administrative exigency, in accordance with law. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Bablu